



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE		FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/019,063 12/27/2001 .		Gerhard Niedermair	449122019600	1764		
25227	7590	01/12/2006		EXAM	EXAMINER	
		RSTER LLP	ARMSTRONG, ANGELA A			
1650 TYSON SUITE 300	AS BOULI	EVARD	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
MCLEAN, 1	VA 22102	2		2654		
				DATE MAILED: 01/12/2006	5	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Applic	cation No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary			9,063	NIEDERMAIR,	GERHARD		
			iner	Art Unit			
			a A. Armstrong	2654			
T Period for R	he MAILING DATE of this communicately	tion appears on	the cover sheet w	vith the correspondence	address		
WHICHE - Extension after SIX - If NO peri - Failure to Any reply	TENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR EVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAIL is of time may be available under the provisions of 3 (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communic od for reply is specified above, the maximum statuto reply within the set or extended period for reply will, received by the Office later than three months after intent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ING DATE OF 7 CFR 1.136(a). In n cation. bry period will apply at by statute, cause the	THIS COMMUN no event, however, may a nd will expire SIX (6) MO a application to become A	ICATION. reply be timely filed NTHS from the mailing date of this BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status							
2a)⊠ Th 3)⊡ Sir	nce this application is in condition for	☐ This action allowance exc	is non-final. cept for formal ma	•	he merits is		
CIO	sed in accordance with the practice	under <i>Ex parte</i>	<i>Quayle</i> , 1935 C.I	D. 11, 455 O.G. 215.			
Disposition	of Claims						
4)⊠ Cla	aim(s) <u>1-9</u> is/are pending in the applic	cation.					
	Of the above claim(s) is/are v	withdrawn from	consideration.				
· <u> </u>	5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
·	aim(s) <u>1-9</u> is/are rejected.						
·	aim(s) is/are objected to. aim(s) are subject to restriction	n and/or electic	on requirement				
6) <u> </u> Cla	airi(s) are subject to restriction	ii anu/or electic	m requirement.				
Application	Papers						
9)∐ The	e specification is objected to by the E	xaminer.					
10)□ The	e drawing(s) filed on is/are: a))□ accepted o	r b)□ objected to	by the Examiner.			
	plicant may not request that any objection	- T	• •				
	placement drawing sheet(s) including the		•		, -		
11)∐ The	e oath or declaration is objected to by	y the Examiner	. Note the attache	ed Office Action or form I	PTO-152.		
Priority und	er 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12)□ Acl a)□ A 1.[2.[3.[Certified copies of the priority dod Certified copies of the priority dod	cuments have cuments have the priority doc	been received. been received in a uments have beel	Application No	al Stage		
* See	the attached detailed Office action for			t received.			
000	sudding admined differ deferring		.c.aca copico no				
	•						
Attachment(s)	References Cited (PTO-892)		∧ [] -t-m:!	Summary (PTO-413)			
	Professor of the Control of the Cont	-948)	Paper No	(s)/Mail Date			
3) 🔲 Informatio	on Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTC (s)/Mail Date		5) Notice of Other:	Informal Patent Application (P	TO-152)		

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
- 2. Claims 1-4 and 6-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Junqua et al (US Patent No. 6,684,185) in view of Shaw (US 2002/0013707).
- 3. Regarding claim 1, Junqua discloses a method for speech processing comprising converting an orthographic input into a phonetic transcription in a first conversion step at col. 3, lines 38-57; a second step of converting from the phonetic transcription into a pseudo-orthographic representation and outputting in this representation at col. 4, lines 3-22 and 37-40; col. 5, lines 33-37. Junqua does not teach analyzing the output pseudo-orthographic representation to determine if the orthographic input was correctly converted. Shaw discloses a system for developing word pronunciation pairs for use in a speech recognition system, in which an editing tool is provided for developing word-pronunciation pairs based on a spelled word input. The editing tool includes a transcription generator that receives the spelled word input from the user and generates a list of suggested phonetic transcriptions. The editor displays the list of suggested phonetic transcriptions to the user and provides a mechanism for selecting the desired pronunciation from the list of suggested phonetic transcriptions.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to modify the system of Junqua to display the transcriptions to the user to have the user select the desired pronunciation, for the purpose of ensuring that user specific words or phrases are transcribed to reflect the user's desired characteristics.

Art Unit: 2654

Regarding claim 2, Junqua discloses a third step of converting an input performed in the psuedo-orthographic representation into the phonetic transcription at col. 4, line 62 continuing to col. 5, line 32.

Regarding claim 3, Junqua discloses conversion of phonetic word units into simple grapheme script units at col. 3, line 38 continuing to col. 4, line 37.

Regarding claim 4, Junqua discloses conversion step executed by accessing a stored phoneme/grapheme assignment table at col. 7, lines 8-65.

Regarding claims 6-9, claims 6-9 are apparatus claims similar in scope and content to method claims 1-4 and therefore are rejected under similar rationale.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Junqua in view of Shaw and further in view of Molnar et al (US Patent 6,411,932).
- 5. Regarding claim 5, Junqua does not teach the implementation of a neural network as a machine-learning/ self-learning technique for obtaining phonetic information. However, implementation of a neural network technique to acquire phonetic information was well known in the art. Molnar teaches a learner technique using a neural network to form pronunciation guesses for words in a training set and for finding a transformation rule that improves the guesses

Application/Control Number: 10/019,063

Art Unit: 2654

(Figure 15, col. 5, lines 4-21) and specifically teaches the system can produce good pronunciations or transcriptions for word not in a training set (col. 5, lines 43-50).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to modify the system of Junqua to implement a neural network in the phonetic transcription system, as suggested by Molnar, for the purpose of producing transcriptions or pronunciations of new words or words not a part of the original vocabulary or grammar, as also suggested by Molnar.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-9 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

Art Unit: 2654

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Angela A. Armstrong whose telephone number is 571-272-7598.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 11:30-8:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richemond Dorvil can be reached on 571-272-7602. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Angela A Armstrong Primary Examiner Art Unit 2654

Augela Amstrong

AAA January 8, 2006